Cas	se 1:23-cr-00082-EK Document 32 Filed 03/0	9/23 Page 1 of 11 PageID #: 196
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK (BROOKLYN)	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
4	Plaintiff,	Case No. 1:23-cr-00082-EK-2
5		Brooklyn, New York
6		March 8, 2023 11:32 a.m.
7	Defendant.	
8	MDANICCDIDM OF ADDATCHMENM HEADING	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF ARRAIGNMENT HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE VERA SCANLON UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
10		
11		nathan Siegel, Esq.
12	U.S	an Stern, Esq. S. Attorney's Office Cadman Plaza East
13		ooklyn, NY 11201
14	For the Defendant: n/a	ı
15	Also Appearing: CJA	On Duty Grainne O'Neill, Esq.
16	Clerk: S.G	· .
17	Court Recorder: Ele	ectronic Sound Recording
18	_	ris Hwang Da Reporting
19	PO	Box 223282 antilly, Virginia 20153
20		8) 302-6772
21		
22		
23	Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording;	
24	transcript produced by transcription service.	
25		

1 (Call to order at 11:32 a.m.)

THE CLERK: Criminal cause for arraignment on the indictment, USA v. Ozy Media Corporation, Ozy Media actually, no corporation here, 23-CR-82.

Parties, please state your name for the record appearing for the Government?

MR. SIEGEL: Good morning, Your Honor. Jonathan Siegel and Dillon Stern for the United States.

THE CLERK: Thank you. And I guess for Ozy Media?

MS. O'NEILL: Well, I don't want to enter an

appearance for Ozy Media, but I am the CJA on duty today and

I'm happy to discuss what should happen.

THE CLERK: Okay.

MS. O'NEILL: Grainne O'Neill.

THE COURT: Okay, want to start with you or the Government?

MS. O'NEILL: We can start with me. I mean, I -- my what I think and I spoke with Deidre (phonetic). And the issue is that CJA funds can only be used to represent indigent people.

And I know that there is some discussion of whether corporations are people, but not for the purposes of CJA. This is a special program that is designed to help people have lawyers who otherwise couldn't afford them.

And I think here we have a corporation that is, A,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

not a person, but B, you know, I just skimmed the indictment and it looks like they were bringing in millions of dollars. So even if they were a person, it doesn't look like they would qualify, but I can't fill out a financial affidavit with someone that's not here and there's really nothing I can do pursuant to CJA. THE COURT: All right, I mean, this is the point of signing the order with the limited representation to find out what your position is and understanding. All right, so for the Government, we have the letter from you. Is that what you wanted to happen? Do you want to put any of that on the record? What is it your --MR. SIEGEL: Yeah. THE COURT: (Indiscernible) and then what you've now heard from CJA counsel? MR. SIEGEL: Yes, Your Honor. So just to state the -- what --THE COURT: Hang on. You should go back.

MR. SIEGEL: Oh, well.

THE COURT: Yeah.

THE CLERK: Sorry, about that. Thank you.

THE COURT: Sorry, thank you.

MR. SIEGEL: To state what for the record was probably obvious to all of us in the room, Ozy Media has not appeared. They were required to do so at 11:00 a.m. today

based on the summons.

Under Rule 11, there's a procedure for if an organizational defendant doesn't appear. It's 11 I believe

(a) (4). If the organizational defendant does not appear, the Court automatically enters a plea of not guilty.

But then, the larger question -- so that from our view, that much is straightforward.

The larger question is where do we go from here?

Under Rule 4, the Court is authorized to take any action

authorized by U.S. law if the corporation fails to appear.

Courts have found what that includes is that the Court can appoint counsel for the corporation.

Now Ms. O'Neill's point is well taken that may not be possible under the Criminal Justice Act. What courts have done depending on the circumstances is they have appointed counsel to be paid at the corporation's expense. In some instances, they have appointed counsel to act in a pro bono capacity.

I think it may make sense for the Court to take some time and think about who would be an appropriate attorney.

This is a large case. We have over a million documents to produce and whoever represents Ozy is going to have to be producing documents that Ozy is required to produce.

So this is not the run-of-the-mill case that we have going through the courthouse. So it -- our position would be that the Court should give thought to who would be an

appropriate person and what would be the appropriate mechanism to appoint them, either at the corporation's expense or pro bono, but then to really promptly get someone who can stand up for Ozy, so that this case can move forward.

The other thing that we would ask that the Court do to make clear is the line between Carlos Watson, the co-defendant and Ozy Media has always been extremely blurry.

And it seems that Carlos Watson and his attorneys are continuing to try to blur that line.

Last night, Mr. Watson's attorneys filed a letter purportedly on Ozy's behalf, asking for a plea of not guilty to be entered on behalf of Ozy or for an adjournment to be made for Ozy.

We would like the Court to make clear what is black letter law that whoever represents Ozy represents Ozy, the corporation, which is separate from Mr. Watson, and that Ozy does have at least one independent director, who should be the person who is speaking for Ozy, as opposed to their indicted CEO.

THE COURT: All right, you want to say anything?

MS. O'NEILL: I --

THE COURT: (Indiscernible.)

MS. O'NEILL: No, I'll just sit here.

THE COURT: Okay, all right. So the Government's application is that the Court consider who or what firm should

1 be appointed to represent the corporation. You want to make a 2 submission on this? I mean --3 MR. SIEGEL: I --4 THE COURT: -- he was the one that was for this very 5 quick turnaround. 6 MR. SIEGEL: Your Honor, I don't think it would be 7 appropriate for us to recommend attorneys. 8 THE COURT: No, that's what I meant. This what -- I 9 don't even know with this case, so what the parameters are for 10 what you are envisioning would be the workload of the 11 (indiscernible) million documents plus. 12 MR. SIEGEL: So we have -- we have over a million 13 documents to produce. 14 THE COURT: Uh-huh. 15 MR. SIEGEL: Ozy itself was a going concern at least 16 until recently and has documents of its own that need to be 17 reviewed, but likely number in the many millions. 18 So this is a big-time consuming job. I know there 19 are many members of the bar, who take on cases like this and 20 are able to do cases like this. 21 And I think it's a question for the Court to find who 22 is the appropriate person who has the availablity and the 23 capacity to do this. 24 THE COURT: The financial circumstances are what? 25 MR. SIEGEL: Of the company?

1 THE COURT: Yes. 2 MR. SIEGEL: Mysterious is the answer. 3 THE COURT: Okay, well, all right, but your 4 suggestion was that the company pay the attorney? 5 MR. SIEGEL: What courts --6 THE COURT: (Indiscernible?) 7 MR. SIEGEL: What courts have generally done is that 8 it is the corporation's responsibility to pay and the Court 9 orders that. 10 If the company can make a showing that it is 11 insolvent and cannot pay, then I think there needs to be a 12 determination of if it is appropriate to appoint someone pro 13 bono to do it, which courts have done. 14 THE COURT: All right, are there any upcoming dates 15 in the case? 16 MR. SIEGEL: Yes, Your Honor. There's a status 17 conference scheduled for both Mr. Watson and Ozy Media on April 18 3rd. 19 Given that Ozy hasn't appeared, it's not clear 20 whether the speedy trial clock has even started for Ozy, but in 21 an abundance of caution, we would move that to the extent the 22 speedy trial clock has started, that time be excluded from now 23 until April 3rd. 24 That will allow time for the Court to identify and

appoint counsel for Ozy and allow time for the parties to

25

confer about discovery, which is going to be large and complicated in this case.

And I'll note that Judge Pollak previously entered an order of excludable delay as to Defendant Watson up through April 3rd.

THE COURT: Okay, all right. We'll enter a plea of not guilty and without determining whether (indiscernible) or not, to the extent it has time to be excluded, because it sounds like an awful lot of discovery at a minimum. And (indiscernible) yet or no nothing?

MR. SIEGEL: There's been no motion or ruling on that.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, so time excluded through the conference with the district judge for Ozy Media as it was for Watson.

And certainly the public's interest and interest of justice and the corporation's interest (indiscernible) figure out what's going on. Okay, anything else?

MR. SIEGEL: Not from the Government, thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, you're off the hook.

MS. O'NEILL: Thank you, Judge.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

THE COURT: (Indiscernible) I think the application as signed was just a representation through this appearance.

1 MS. O'NEILL: Sounds good. 2 THE COURT: All right. 3 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you. 4 MR. SIEGEL: Thank you, Your Honor. 5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Great, thank you. 6 (Recess taken at 11:41 a.m., recommencing at 11:52 a.m.) 7 THE CLERK: We're back on the record, USA v. Ozy 8 Media. Second call. 9 MR. SIEGEL: Your Honor, Jonathan Siegel for the 10 United States. Good morning. 11 THE COURT: All right, we're in the strange position 12 of not having counsel or an appearance, but since the 13 obligation under 5(f) rests with the Government, the Government 14 is reminded of its 5(f) obligations under the Federal Rules of 15 Criminal Procedure, as well as Brady v. Maryland and its 16 progeny and that line of cases. 17 The Government has to disclose to the Defense all 18 information favorable to an accused that's material either to 19 quilt or to punishment and known to the prosecution. 20 And prosecution shall disclose such information to 21 the defense promptly after its existence becomes known to the 22 prosecution so the defense can make effective use of the 23 information in the preparation of its case. The Court will 24 enter a more detailed order in this regard. 25 So, for the Government, do you understand your

```
1
     obligations under 5(f) and Brady?
 2
               MR. SIEGEL: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: And will the Government comply?
 4
               MR. SIEGEL: Yes, Your Honor.
 5
               THE COURT: Will the Government read the order that's
 6
     entered and comply with it?
 7
               MR. SIEGEL: Yes, Your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT: All right, I will note, even though we're
 9
     putting on the record, this may be something that should be
10
     raised when there is counsel so that counsel is aware of these
11
     obligations and the Government's commitment to comply with
12
     them.
               Obviously, we expect counsel to be familiar with it,
13
14
     but having it said on the record, I think, is a helpful
15
     exercise. So when we get the counsel issue resolved, you can
16
     re-visit this. All right.
17
               MR. SIEGEL: Thank you very much, Your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: Anything else?
19
               MR. SIEGEL: No, thank you.
20
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
21
               THE CLERK: Okay.
22
           (Proceedings concluded at 11:54 a.m.)
23
24
```

25